



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

NH

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/400,568 09/21/99 FLOYD

J 96B037/3

EXAMINER

IM52/0615

EXXON CHEMICAL COMPANY
LAW TECHNOLOGY
P O BOX 2149
BAYTOWN TX 77522-2149

CHEUNG, W
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

9

1713
DATE MAILED:

06/15/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/400,568

Applicant(s)

FLOYD ET AL.

Examiner

William K Cheung

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 29, 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 are cancelled by the Preliminary Amendment under 37CFR1.115 submitted by attorney William G. Muller on September 21, 1999.
2. In view of an amendment submitted by attorney (Paper No. 8) on May 29, 2001, cancel claim 9 and add new claims 19-20. Claims 10-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 10-14 are dependent on cancelled claim 9. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 10 -18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jejelowo (US 5,359,015). Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jejelowo (US 5,359,015).

*The invention of claims 10-20 relates to an **ethylene homopolymer or copolymer** having a melt index ratio (**MIR**) less than 35, preferably less than 25, a molecular weight distribution (**MWD**) of 2 to 15, a comonomer distribution breadth Index (**CDBI**) equal or greater than 60, and a melt strength (**MS**) equal or greater than $[6.0 - (6.0 \times \log (MI))]$ or equal or greater than $[8.0 - (6.0 \times \log (MI))]$. Further the MI ranges from 0.3 to 1.2. The comonomer for the copolymer is a **C₃ to C₈ α -olefinic monomer**.*

Jejelowo discloses a **polymerization process** to make ethylene homopolymers and copolymers (col. 21, line 37). In working examples, Jejelowo discloses a **gas phase** polymerization process (col. 16, line 59) to make **ethylene/1-butene copolymer** (col. 16, line 52-53; line 56-59) using an **asymmetric substituted cyclopentadienyl ligands** (col. 16, line 20-21) **metallocene catalyst** based on the use of **zirconium** transition metal (col. 16, line 37). The copolymer products have a **density** in the range of **0.904 to 0.944 g/cm³** with a **MWD ranges from 2.4 to 2.6** (col. 17, Table 1, Examples 3 & 4). In

Art Unit: 1713

view of the substantial similarities in catalyst, monomer, and comonomer composition and similar gas phase polymerization process in the disclosure of Jejelowo and the disclosure in the instant application, the examiner has a reasonable basis to believe that the additional limitations on MIR, CDMI and the mathematical relationship between MS and MI are inherently possessed by Jejelowo. Since the PTO does not have proper means to conduct experiments, the burden of proof is now shifted to applicants to show otherwise. **In re Best**, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977); **In re Fitzgerald**, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

Even assuming the MIR, CDMI and the mathematical relationship between MS and MI set forth in claim 19 and the MIR, CDMI and the mathematical relationship between MS and MI of Jejelowo are not the same, it would still have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to make ethylene homopolymers and copolymers having the claimed properties because the disclosure of Jejelowo generically embrace the claimed ethylene homopolymers and copolymers and the person of ordinary skill in the art would have expected all the embodiments of the reference to work.

Although the new base claim 19 is claiming elements that are not disclosed by the prior art, however, the claimed product invention as a whole is substantially identical to the product disclosed in the prior art and in light of the specification of the instant application. Further, applicants argue that the instant invention differs from the invention disclosed in the prior art is that the instant invention relates to an ethylene-base polymer

Art Unit: 1713

product prepared by a bridged metallocene catalyst while the ethylene-base polymer product of Jejelowo is prepared by an unbridged metallocene catalyst. However, according to the specification of the instant application, applicants disclose the use of unbridged and bridged metallocene catalyst for preparing the inventive ethylene based polymer products (see Table 1 to IV, page 16-25). According to Table I to IV, the examiner does not find any noticeable differences between the polymers prepared by using unbridged and bridged metallocene catalysts. Therefore, applicants fail to show the criticality of using unbridged and bridged metallocene catalysts for preparing the ethylene based polymers.

In view of lack of criticality of using bridged metallocene catalysts for preparing the ethylene based polymers, the rejection of claims 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jejelowo (US 5,359,015) is proper because the determination of patentability is based on the product itself even for product-by-process claims. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). "Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process."

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K Cheung whose telephone number is (703) 305-0392. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (703) 308-2450. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-5885 for regular communications and (703) 305-5885 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2351.



William K. Cheung
June 14, 2001



DAVID W. WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700